

### REMARKS

The Examiner reopened prosecution after the filing of Applicant's Appeal Brief; rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (U.S. Patent No. 6,573,940) in view of De Haan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,016) ("De Haan").

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

#### Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 as being unpatentable over Yang in view of De Haan. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Regarding claims 1, 3, and 5, neither Yang nor De Haan nor their combination teaches or suggests "adaptively filtering . . . using a human vision model." The Examiner asserts that this limitation is met by Yang's filter 112, but Applicant disagrees.

A "human vision model" is a term of art well known to those of ordinary skill in the art of video signal processing. It denotes a machine vision model which is designed to match the perceptual response of the human vision system. For a detailed discussion of human vision models, see U.S. Patent No. 6,907,143, referenced in Applicant's specification at page 2, line 24.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not consider Yang, De Haan, or their combination to teach or suggest "filtering . . . using a human vision model" because neither makes any mention of modeling the perceptual response of the human vision system. Yang's filter 112 merely "removes spectral components introduced by the zero-padding" (column 4, line 15) and De Haan's adaptive filter merely adapts to "the amount of distortion in the image sequence." (column 1, line 67) As the Examiner points out, the combination of Yang and De Haan may "remove artifacts ('noise') from the video image which are visible to a human viewer" (Rejection, page 3), however the mere fact that a video signal processing step produces a visible result does not mean that it uses a "human vision model."

For at least this reason, claims 1, 3, and 5, as well as claims 2, 4, and 6 which depend from them respectively, are not rendered obvious by Yang in view of De Haan. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1-6 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin M. Ferguson

By: /Michael A. Nelson/

Michael A. Nelson  
Reg. No. 59,450  
(503) 627-1785 (Voice)  
(503) 627-7119 (Fax)

July 28, 2008

Tektronix, Inc.  
P.O. Box 500  
Delivery Station 50-LAW  
Beaverton, OR 97077